

A NOTE IN REPLY TO DOCTOR PERRY

MY attention has just been called to an article in this JOURNAL, by Doctor Ralph Barton Perry, entitled 'Recent Philosophical Procedure with Reference to Science,' in which I am charged with 'indulging in considerable riddling of the conceptions of science,' censured for 'criticizing science negatively and not positively, and coupled with Professor Karl Pearson as 'furnishing convenient illustrations of reactionary tendencies in contemporary philosophy of science,' mine being 'the untenable position of refuting science in detail and his that of refuting philosophy in general.' Now, I, for my part, should be grateful to Doctor Perry, if he could, either privately or otherwise, cite instances in justification of his strictures of my procedure. My concern has been with Naturalism, which is a form of philosophy and not science, and a form of philosophy which scientific men—Professor Pearson among them—have done a good deal to expose. I have devoted two or three pages in my second edition (Vol. I., pp. 303-5) to this point, and will venture to refer anyone interested to these. Here I will content myself with saying that I have never referred to any scientific details except they were misconstrued by the naturalistic philosopher, and never without falling back on scientific specialists for support. JAMES WARD.

TRINITY COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE, ENGLAND.

SOCIETIES

THE NEW YORK ACADEMY OF SCIENCES. SECTION OF ANTHROPOLOGY AND PSYCHOLOGY

THE regular meeting of the section was held on March 28 in conjunction with the New York Branch of the American Psychological Association. The afternoon session was held at the Psychological Laboratory of Columbia University, the evening session was held as usual at the American Museum of Natural History. The program was as follows:

Mental Resemblance of Twins: Professor E. L. THORNDIKE.

A report was made on the general results of a comparison of twins in tests of attention, perception, association, rate of movement, addition, multiplication and stature. The resemblances, as measured by a rough, preliminary method, were about .75. The amount of this resemblance that should be attributed to similarities in home training was apparently slight. There was no evidence in the